JS

CIVIL COVER SHEET

12-01-3198

JS 44 (Rev. 09/11)

The IS 44 civil coversheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS The Charter Oak Fire Insurance Company a/s/o the Covington at Providence Homeowners' Association				DEFENDAN	ГS		
			* .	OMEGA FLEX,	nc.		
(b) County of Residence	e of First Listed Plaintiff	Hartford County		County of Resider	ice of First Lis	ted Defendant	Chester County
	EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF					PLAINTIFF CASE	S ONLY)
	(The second second		NOTE:	IN LAND O	ONDEMNATION T OF LAND INVO	CASES, USE THE LOCATION O
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name	, Address, and Telephone Numb	ber)		Attorneys (If Know	n)		
Thomas J. Underwood, P.C., 20 E. Taunton Ro							
II. BASIS OF JURISE		" in One Box Only)		IZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Bex for Plain
☐ 1 U.S. Government	☐ 3 Federal Question		(F	or Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff		(U.S. Government Not a Party)		of This State		Incorporated or F of Business In Th	Principal Place / 🗇 4 🕱 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity	hip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen	of Another State	1 2 1 2	Incorporated and	
Detendant	(inflicate Cutzens	nip oj Farties in Hem 111)	Citiman	Sbi		of Business In	
				or Subject of a gn Country	<u> </u>	Foreign Nation	77 6 17 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		Only) DRTS	FOR	FEITURE/PENALTY	RAN	KRUPTCY	I OTHER STATUTES
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY		Orug Related Seizure		al 28 USC 158	375 False Claims Act
120 Marine	310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury -	,	of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Witho	İrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	☐ 690 C	Other	28 U	SC 157	410 Antitrust
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical	ļ		PROPER	TY RIGHTS	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
& Enforcement of Judgment		Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copyr		☐ 460 Deportation
151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability			☐ 830 Patent		☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
1 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal			☐ 840 Trade	mark	Corrupt Organizations
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability		LABOR	600141		☐ 480 Consumer Credit
J 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPERT	TV /7 710 F	air Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (SECURITY 1395ft	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud		act Standards	☐ 862 Black		Exchange
1 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	□ 720 L	abor/Mgmt. Relations		C/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	☐ 380 Other Personal		ailway Labor Act	☐ 864 SSID		☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
1 195 Contract Product Liability 1 196 Franchise	☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage		amily and Medical	□ 865 RSI (4	05(g))	893 Environmental Matters
7 190 Franchise	☐ 362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability		eave Act ther Labor Litigation			895 Freedom of Information Act
	Med. Malpractice			mpi. Ret. Inc.	1		☐ 896 Arbitration
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	Sc Sc	curity Act	FEDERA	L TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate			☐ 870 Taxes	(U.S. Plaintiff	Act/Review or Appeal of
	441 Voting	Sentence				endant)	Agency Decision
	☐ 442 Employment	Habeas Corpus: 530 General	1		□ 871 IRS—		☐ 950 Constitutionality of
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	530 General 535 Death Penalty	- m	MMIGRATION	1 2008	C 7609	State Statutes
	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Other		nturalization Application	7		
/ '	Employment	☐ 550 Civil Rights	□ 463 Ha	ibeas Corpus -			
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 555 Prison Condition		ien Detainee	1		
		☐ 560 Civil Detainee -	(P	risoner Petition)	1		
	Other		1/1 465 Or		1		
		Conditions of Confinement		her Immigration tions		į	
7. ORIGIN (Place an	Other 448 Education """ in One Box Only) noved from	Conditions of Confinement	4 Reinstate Reopene	ed or 5 Trans another (specif	w)	□ 6 Multidistri Litigation	ct
7. ORIGIN (Place an	Other 0 448 Education 1 "X" in One Box Only) 1 oved from	Conditions of Confinement Remanded from Appellate Court tute under which you are use:	4 Reinstate Reopene	ed or 5 Trans another (specif	er district	Litigation	ct
ORIGIN (Place an Proceeding State	Other 1 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 3 ''X'' in One Box Only) 3 ''X'' in One Box Only) 5 ''X'' in One Box Only) 6 ''X'' in One Box Only) 7 ''X'' in One Box Only) 8 ''X'' in One Box Only) 8 ''X'' in One Box Only) 9 ''X'' in One Box Only) 1 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 3 ''X'' in One Box Only) 4 ''X'' in One Box Only) 5 ''X'' in One Box Only) 6 ''X'' in One Box Only) 6 ''X'' in One Box Only) 7 ''X'' in One Box Only) 8 ''X'' in One Box Only) 8 ''X'' in One Box Only) 9 ''X'' in One Box Only) 9 ''X'' in One Box Only) 1 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 3 ''X'' in One Box Only) 1 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 2 ''X'' in One Box Only) 3 ''X'' in One Box Only) 3 ''X'' in One Box Only) 4 ''X'' in One Box Only) 5 ''X'' in One Box Only) 6 ''X'' in One Box Only) 8 ''X'' in One Box Only) 1 ''X'' in	Conditions of Confinement Remanded from Appellate Court tute under which you are use: I caused a fire	4 Reinstate Reopene filing (Do n	ed or 5 Trans another (specif	er district v) nutes unless divi	Litigation ersity):	f demanded in complaint: X Yes No
ORIGIN (Place an Proceeding State) I. CAUSE OF ACTION II. REQUESTED IN	Other Ot	Conditions of Confinement Remanded from Appellate Court tute under which you are use: I caused a fire	4 Reinstate Reopene filing (Do n	tions d or	cr district inutes unless divi	Litigation ersity): ECK YES only i	f demanded in complaint:
ORIGIN Original Proceeding I. CAUSE OF ACTIO II. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: III. RELATED CASE	Other Ot	Conditions of Confinement Remanded from Appellate Court tute under which you are use: d caused a fire S A CLASS ACTION 23	4 Reinstate Reopene filing (Do n	tions d or	cr district inutes unless divi	Litigation ersity): ECK YES only i RY DEMAND:	f demanded in complaint: X Yes No
ORIGIN (Place and Proceeding State Procedure Proceeding State Procedure Proceeding State Procedure	Other Ot	Conditions of Confinement Remanded from Appellate Court tute under which you are use: d caused a fire IS A CLASS ACTION 23 JUDGE	4 Reinstate Reopene filing (Do n	ed or 5 Trans anoth (specifor cite jurisdictional state) AND \$	cr district inutes unless divi	Litigation ersity): ECK YES only i RY DEMAND:	f demanded in complaint: X Yes No

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERNO STREET OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	e used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: One Tower Square, Hartford, CT	06183
Address of Defendant: 451 Creamery Way, Exton, PA 19	3141
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 11177 Saintsbury Plac (Use Reverse Side For A	e, Charlotte, NC dditional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes M No□
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No⊠
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year.	ar previously terminated action in this court?
a Booking to Lind and the Control of	Yes□ No⊠
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior s action in this court?	uit pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes□ No⊠
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier n terminated action in this court?	umbered case pending or within one year previously Yes No No No
terminated action in this court:	162 — NORV
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	s case filed by the same individual?
	Yes□ No⊠
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. □ Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. □ Civil Rights	7. R Products Liability
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. All other Federal Question Cases	Julia W J ZWIZ
(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERTI	
(Check Appropriate Cat	
 I, Thomas J. Underwood, Jr. counsel of record do hereby certify Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and b 	
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
Kener outer man monetary damages is sought.	Accessed
DATE: (1/11/2/2)	<u>#81244</u>
Attorney at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	Attorney I.D.# e has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w	ithin one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	Jone Providence and the property
Idualana Man Illia	# SIJUV
DATE:	Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)



The Charter Oak Fire Insurance

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

)
Telephone		FAX Num	iber	E-Mail Address	
856-767-	le80) x11	856-767-	- 6810	Underwood T@ St	utman kw co
Date		Attorney-	at-law/	Attorney for	
6/6/2	012	Mudel	Per	Plaintiff	
()	C		,		. (%)
(f) Standard	l Managem	ent – Cases that do n	ot fall into any	one of the other tracks.	(x)
commo the cou	aly referred	l to as complex and the erse side of this form	nat need specia	l or intense management by explanation of special	
(e) Special	Manageme	ent – Cases that do no	t fall into track	s (a) through (d) that are	
(d) Asbesto	s – Cases i e to asbest	nvolving claims for pos.	personal injury	or property damage from	()
(c) Arbitra	tion – Case	s required to be desig	gnated for arbit	ration under Local Civil Rule 53.2	. ()
		Cases requesting revi es denying plaintiff S		on of the Secretary of Health Benefits.	()
		Cases brought under	-	• •	()
				GEMENT TRACKS:	
filing the side of the designation the plainting to which t	complaint a is form.) I n, that defe ff and all or hat defenda	nd serve a copy on all in the event that a deendant shall, with its ther parties, a Case Mant believes the case s	defendants. (Sefendant does not be sefended to sefende	tee § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the not agree with the plaintiff regards, submit to the clerk of court and ack Designation Form specifying the ned.	e reverse ling said serve on
In accord	ance with t	he Civil Justice Expe	ense and Delay	Reduction Plan of this court, connation Form in all civil cases at the	unsel for
MEGA FLEX	, Inc.	V •	:	NO 🐔 👩	3198
covidence	Homeow	Covington at ners' Associat	ion		
7mn2n112/	7 / A + h A	73 m m 2 m 1			



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE CHARTER OAK FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY as subrogee of the Covington at Providence Homeowners' Association	2 : : :	Civil Action			
Plaintiff,	:	No.:	<u> </u>		
vs.	:	COMPLAINT	£Q)
OMEGA FLEX, INC.	: :				a⊾,#A
:		(JURY TRIAL	DEMAND	ED)	
Defendant.	:				
Defendant.	:				

Plaintiff, the Charter Oak Fire Insurance Company as subrogee of the Covington at Providence Homeowners' Association (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") by and through their attorneys hereby bring this Complaint and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, the Charter Oak Fire Insurance Company (hereinafter "Charter Oak") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Connecticut with its principal place of business located at One Tower Square, Hartford, Connecticut, 06183.
- 2. At all material times, Charter Oak was duly authorized to issue policies of insurance in the State of North Carolina, and provided insurance to the Covington at Providence Homeowners' Association (hereinafter referred to as the "Covington") under policy number 10680-6794L131 (hereinafter referred to as "the Policy")
- 3. Defendant, Omega Flex, Inc. (hereinafter "Omega") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with its principal place of business located at 451 Creamery Way, Exton, Pennsylvania 19341-2509.

4. At all times material hereto, Defendant Omega designed, engineered, manufactured, inspected, tested, marketed, sold, distributed and/or placed into the stream of commerce a product known as corrugated stainless steel tubing ("CSST") for use in the distribution of natural gas and/or propane in various applications, including residential homes and commercial buildings. Specifically, Omega placed its CSST into the stream of commerce such that it was installed in the home located at the Property.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. Plaintiff, Charter Oak is a citizen of the State of Connecticut. Defendant, Omega is a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As such, diversity exists between the plaintiff and the defendant.
- 6. The amount in controversy in this matter exceeds \$75,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs.
- 7. Accordingly, the United States District Court has jurisdiction over this matter based upon diversity of citizenship pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332.
- 8. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391, venue is proper within the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because it is the judicial district wherein defendant is incorporated and has its principal place of business.

BACKGROUND

- 9. This matter involves a fire in a corporate-owned unit of a townhouse complex known as Covington at Providence. The subject unit has an address of 11177 Saintsbury Place, Charlotte, North Carolina (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").
- 10. At all times material hereto, Omega was engaged in the business of engineering, designing, manufacturing, testing, inspecting, distributing, marketing, packaging and/or

selling corrugated stainless steel gas tubing under the brand name "TracPipe" (hereinafter "CSST").

- 11. At all times relevant hereto, the Plaintiff, Charter Oak insured the Covington at Providence HOA.
- 12. During construction of the Property in 2006, CSST was installed for the distribution of gas at the Property.
- 13. Prior to July 13, 2010, Omega manufactured the CSST installed in the Property.
- 14. On or about July 13, 2010, a lightning strike occurred at or near the Property causing the CSST to fail, resulting in a hole.
- 15. This hole allowed gas to escape from the CSST and ignite a substantial fire that spread to the rest of the Property (hereinafter the "Fire").
- 16. As a result of the fire, Plaintiff's insured suffered significant damage to the Property and its contents in excess of \$75,000.00.

COUNT I – NEGLIGENCE

- 17. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.
- 18. Defendant Omega owed Plaintiff's insured a duty to use ordinary care in connection with the design and manufacture of the CSST, the selection of materials used to manufacture the CSST, the assembly of the CSST, the inspection of the CSST, the testing of the CSST and the packaging of the CSST in order to protect users from an unreasonable risk of harm when using the CSST for its intended purpose.
- 19. Defendant Omega owed Plaintiff's insured a duty to give reasonable and adequate instructions with respect to the conditions and methods of the safe use of CSST since

danger of fire was reasonably foreseeable when CSST was used in the manner in which it was intended.

- 20. Defendant Omega owed Plaintiff's insured a duty to exercise ordinary care and skill in connection with the design, engineering, manufacture, inspection, testing, marketing, sale and/or distribution of CSST and/or placing CSST into the stream of commerce.
- 21. Defendant Omega owed Plaintiff's insured a duty to exercise ordinary care to protect Plaintiff's insured against the risk of fire.
- 22. Defendant Omega owed Plaintiff's insured a duty to exercise ordinary care to ensure that the CSST was reasonably fit for the purpose for which it was designed, engineered, manufactured, inspected, tested, marketed, sold, distributed, placed into the stream of commerce and/or intended to be used.
- 23. Defendant Omega owed Plaintiff's insured a duty to warn that the CSST was not reasonably fit for the purpose for which it was designed, engineered, manufactured, inspected, tested, marketed, sold, distributed, placed into the stream of commerce and/or intended to be used.
- 24. Defendant Omega breached these duties by failing to exercise ordinary care and skill in the design, engineering, manufacture, inspection, testing, marketing, sale, distribution of CSST and/or placing CSST into the stream of commerce, both generally and specifically, as follows:
 - a. Negligently designing, engineering, manufacturing, testing, marketing,
 distributing, selling and/or inspecting CSST and/or placing CSST into the
 stream of commerce:

- Failing to observe and exercise a reasonable degree of care and skill in the design, engineering, manufacture, testing, marketing, distribution, sale and/or inspection of CSST and/or placing CSST into the stream of commerce;
- c. Failing to design, engineer, manufacture, test, market, distribute, sell and/or inspect CSST and/or place CSST into the stream of commerce so that it was safe and fit for its intended use;
- d. Failing to ensure that CSST could withstand anticipated levels of electrical activity generated by lightning strikes;
- e. Failing to implement an appropriate bonding and/or grounding procedure in connection with the installation of CSST;
- f. Failing to warn Plaintiff's insured that the CSST piping was defective and could start a fire;
- g. Failing to properly train and/or supervise its employees, agents, servants, contractors and/or other representatives in the design, engineering, manufacture, testing, marketing, distribution, sale and/or inspection of the CSST piping so that it was safe and free from risk of fire;
- h. Utilizing engineers, designers, laborers, consultants, contractors and/or employees that Defendant Omega knew, or in the exercise of due care, should have known, were not properly trained to design, engineer, manufacture, test, inspect, sell, market and/or distribute CSST and/or place CSST into the stream of commerce;

- Failing to design, engineer, manufacture, market, distribute, sell, test and/or inspect CSST and/or place CSST into the stream of commerce in accordance with local, state and/or federal statutes and/or other recognized and/or applicable codes, laws, rules, regulations and/or other requirements;
- j. Failing to discover, repair and/or correct the defect(s) and/or deficiency(ies) in the design, engineering, manufacture, packaging, testing, inspection, marketing, distribution and/or sale of CSST and/or placing CSST into the stream of commerce, which may have caused the CSST to fail in the course of its normal and intended use;
- k. Failing to design, engineer, manufacture, test, inspect, market, distribute and/or sell CSST and/or place the CSST into the stream of commerce in such a way as to not create a foreseeable risk of harm to people and/or property;
- 1. Failing to provide installers, distributors, salespeople and/or intended users with adequate instructions, warnings and/or information concerning the defect(s) and/or deficiency(ies) that caused the CSST to fail in the course of its normal and intended use; and
- m. Failing to properly design, engineer, manufacture, inspect, test, distribute, sell and/or market the CSST and/or place the CSST into the stream of commerce so as to ensure its fitness and safety.

- 25. The July 13, 2010 fire and resultant damages were the direct and proximate result of the aforementioned negligence, gross negligence, recklessness and/or carelessness and/or negligent acts and/or omissions by Defendant Omega.
- 26. The negligence, gross negligence, recklessness and/or carelessness and/or negligent acts and/or omissions described in the preceding paragraphs were committed by Defendant Omega and/or its duly authorized agents, servants, workmen, contractors, employees and/or other authorized representatives of Defendant Omega, acting within the scope and during the course of their relationship, agency and/or employment.
- 27. The July 13, 2010 fire and resulting damage was a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Defendant Omega's negligence and/or carelessness.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff demands judgment in its favor and against Defendant Omega in an amount in excess of \$75,000.00, together with pre- and post-judgment interest, costs and such other relief as this Court deems just and proper under the circumstances.

COUNT II - STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY

- 28. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.
- 29. Defendant Omega was engaged in the business of designing, engineering, manufacturing, inspecting, testing, distributing, selling and/or marketing CSST and/or placing CSST into the stream of commerce.
- 30. Defendant Omega's CSST was expected to, and did, reach the Property without substantial change in its condition.

- 31. Defendant Omega supplied the CSST in a defective condition that rendered it unreasonably dangerous.
- 32. The CSST was defective, in that it failed, released gas and caused a substantial fire.
- 33. Plaintiff's insured utilized the CSST for the purposes and in the manner intended and/or reasonably anticipated by Defendant Omega.
- 34. Plaintiff's insured could not, by the exercise of reasonable care, have discovered the defect(s) and/or deficiency(ies) herein mentioned and/or perceived the danger inherent in the CSST.
- 35. Plaintiff's insured's damages resulting from the July 13, 2010 fire were the result of:
 - a. The manufacturing defect in the CSST, evidenced by the fact that it failed, leaked gas and ignited a fire, existed when the CSST left the possession and/or control of Omega;
 - b. The failure to warn Plaintiff's insured of the serious and foreseeable risk of harm posed by the defect(s) and/or deficiency(ies) in the CSST, which caused it to fail, leak gas and ignite a fire in the course of its normal and mtended use; and
 - c. The design defect, evidenced by the failure of the CSST, resultant gas leak and fire, which existed when the existed when the CSST left the possession and/or control of Omega.
- 36. The defective condition of the CSST was the direct, proximate and foreseeable cause of the July 13, 2010 fire and Plaintiff's insured's resultant damages.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff demands judgment in its favor and against Defendant Omega in an amount in excess of \$75,000.00, together with pre- and post-judgment interest, costs and such other relief as this Court deems just and proper under the circumstances.

COUNT III – BREACH OF WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY

- 37. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.
- 38. Defendant Omega expressly and/or impliedly agreed to design, engineer, manufacture, inspect, test, distribute, sell and/or market CSST and/or place CSST into the stream of commerce in a good and workmanlike manner, and in accordance with all relevant local, state and federal laws, rules, regulations and codes, as well as in accordance with all industry standards and trade practices.
- 39. Defendant Omega could reasonably expect that homeowners generally, and Plaintiff's insureds specifically, might utilize CSST.
- 40. Plaintiff's insureds refled on Defendant Omega's express and/or implied representations that the CSST was safe and fit for its normal and intended use.
- 41. Plaintiff's insureds utilized the CSST in a foreseeable and ordinary manner and yet sustained damage when the fire occurred due to defects in the design, engineering, manufacture, inspection, testing, distribution, sale and/or marketing of the CSST and/or placing the CSST into the stream of commerce, which caused damage to the Property.
- 42. Defendant Omega designed, engineered, manufactured, inspected, tested, distributed, sold, marketed and/or placed into the stream of commerce CSST that was not

of merchantable quality, in that it was not fit for the ordinary purpose for which it was

intended, and was not adequately contained, packaged or labeled.

43. The CSST was not fit for the ordinary purpose for which it was intended because

it failed when lightning struck at or near the Property, thereby releasing gas and igniting a

fire that caused significant damage to the Property.

44. The fire of July 13, 2010 and resultant damages were the direct, proximate and

foreseeable result of the unmerchantable condition of the CSST sold by Defendant

Omega.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff demands judgment in its favor and against Defendant

Omega in an amount in excess of \$75,000.00, together with pre- and post-judgment

interest, costs and such other relief as this Court deems just and proper under the

circumstances.

Respectfully Submitted,

LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT A. STUTMAN, P.C.

Dated: 6/6/2012

By:

Thomas J. Underwood, Jr., Esquire

20 East Taunton Road, Suite 403

Berlin, New Jersey 08009 Telephone: (856) 767-6800

Attorney for Plaintiff